

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joshua Channell, Impact Sciences
FROM: Mark Spencer, DKS Associates
DATE: June 23, 2006
SUBJECT: Fremont Patterson Ranch Ballot Initiative P 06125-000
Final Traffic Study- Executive Summary

The City of Fremont has been served with a Notice of Intent to Circulate Petition for the purposes of placing on the November 7, 2006, General Election ballot an initiative, named the "Protect Coyote Hills Natural Area Initiative" (Initiative). The stated intent of the Initiative is to protect and preserve an approximately 520-acre portion of the City's Northern Plain Planning Area. If adopted, the Initiative would limit development in this portion of Fremont to agriculture, outdoor recreation and very low density residential uses. Per State of California Elections Code Section 9212, the City has prepared this evaluation of the impacts the Initiative may have on the City.

This memo provides a preliminary assessment of the traffic analysis conducted for the proposed Patterson Ranch Ballot Initiative. It includes the following four sections:

1. Existing Conditions
2. Analysis Methodology
3. Impacts of Development Scenarios
4. Summary

I. Existing Conditions

The Initiative Area is located in the incorporated area of the City of Fremont within the Northern Plain Planning Area. The area covered by the Initiative is defined in Section 5 of the Initiative as the area "bounded on the north by the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel, on the east and southeast by the Southern Pacific [Union Pacific] Railroad and Paseo Padre Parkway, on the south by State Route 84 and on the west by the Dumbarton Associates Quarry and the Coyote Hills Regional Park.

The key regional and local access routes include:

Interstate-880 connects Fremont to much of the rest of the East Bay, extending from Oakland to San Jose. In the vicinity of its interchange with State Route-84/Decoto Road it has four lanes in each direction and a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane. I-880 carries about 210,000 vehicles per day in this area, including about 13,500 vehicles each peak hour for both directions (Caltrans, 2005 Monitoring Report). Although previously reported to be LOS F by the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, in 2004 the segment of I-880 northbound from Decoto Road to Alvarado Niles Boulevard

improved from LOS F to LOS D (Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, 2004 LOS Monitoring Study).

State Route-84 extends from the Livermore Valley through Niles Canyon, connecting to Decoto Road and the Dumbarton Bridge and into Menlo Park. In the vicinity of the project area SR-84 has at least three travel lanes in each direction, and a high occupancy vehicle lane in the westbound direction as it approaches the Dumbarton Bridge Toll Plaza. SR-84 carries about 84,000 vehicles per day between the Dumbarton Bridge and Newark Boulevard, including about 6,000 in a peak hour in both directions (Caltrans, 2005 Monitoring Report). Although previously reported to be LOS F by the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, in 2004 the segment of SR-84 westbound from Peralta Boulevard to Thornton Avenue improved from LOS F to LOS E. The SR-84 segment eastbound from Thornton Avenue to I-880, however, was rated as LOS F for the first time.(Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, 2004 LOS Monitoring Study).

Paseo Padre Parkway traverses throughout Fremont, from Mission Boulevard in the south to Thornton Avenue in the north in the project area. It has two travel lanes in each direction, with additional turn lanes provided at key intersections. Paseo Padre Parkway carries between 11,000 and 12,00 vehicles per day in the vicinity of Ardenwood Boulevard.

Ardenwood Boulevard connects Jarvis Road in Newark to Union City Boulevard in Union City. It carries about 29,400 vehicles per day south of Paseo Padre Parkway, and about 19,800 vehicles per day north of Paseo Padre Parkway. It generally has two lanes in each direction, with additional turn lanes provided at key intersections.

Roadway Segments

Within the study area there are also several roadway segments that provide access within the Northern Plain planning area as well as between the area and points outside the area either locally or regionally. Table 1 provides a list of roadway segments that are being analyzed as part of this study.

Table 1
Roadway Segments

Roadway	Segment Studied
State Route 84	I-880 to Dumbarton Bridge Toll Plaza
Paseo Padre Pkwy	SR-84 to Fremont Blvd
Ardenwood Blvd	Jarvis Ave to Union City Blvd
Union City Blvd	from Ardenwood Blvd to Dyer St
Decoto Rd	Paseo Padre Pkwy to I-880
Interstate -880	Alvarado Niles Blvd to Thornton Ave.

The above list of roadway segments was chosen in cooperation with City staff as they represent the roadway segments most likely to be impacted by the one of the analyzed development scenarios. This report analyzes the weekday AM and PM peak-hour existing baseline conditions along these roadway segments as well as the cumulative condition under each of the development scenarios.

II. Analysis Methodology

The analysis methodology followed standard traffic analysis procedures. The steps are outlined below:

1. **Prepare vehicle trip generation estimates for the project site for four study scenarios.** This task provided a comparison of the total number of daily and weekday peak hour vehicle trips that would be generated by each of the development scenarios.
 - a. Existing Zoning/General Plan
 - b. Initiative - Residential
 - c. Patterson Ranch Proposal at 800 residential units
 - d. Patterson Ranch Analysis at 1,200 residential units
2. **Run City of Fremont Travel Forecast Model for each of the four scenarios for each cumulative future year condition.** For areas outside of the study area, the model used forecasts consistent with the Alameda County CMA forecasts for 2025. For the study area, the model used a trip generation estimate that included the number of residents, jobs and employees in the area. Then, the model was used to generate a forecast of changes in roadway link volumes, vehicle miles traveled, and vehicles speeds.
3. **Calculate Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadway service levels for each study scenario and Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) for each study scenario.** Based on travel forecast model output, these measures were used to evaluate the potential impacts of each development scenario relative to one another.
4. **Prepare comparison tables of the potential traffic impacts under each study scenario.** The analysis of trip generation, roadway levels of service, and vehicle miles of travel were placed into summary tables.
5. **Determine need for additional roadway or other transportation mitigation measures.** Where appropriate, the analysis concluded with a qualitative discussion of what the improvements measures may be appropriate given the various performance levels.

III. Impacts of Development Scenarios

Using forecast data generated by the City of Fremont Travel Forecast Model, an analysis of Baseline and 2025 Cumulative Conditions under each development scenario was conducted. The results of this analysis are presented below.

Trip Generation. The vehicle trip generation estimate for each development scenario is provided in Table 3 (in Section 4 of this summary report). The estimated number of trips is in proportion to the development intensity proposed under each scenario. The Initiative Scenario - Residential was chosen (compared to a less intensive Initiative

option) since it includes more residential units and would generate some measure of vehicle activity. Compared to the existing General Plan, Initiative - Residential would generate about 6,700 less trips per day, and about 680 less AM peak hour trips and about 885 less PM peak hour trips. The 1,200-unit Patterson Ranch proposal would generate about twice the number of peak-hour trips compared to the existing General Plan, and the 800-unit Patterson Ranch plan would generate proportionately less than the 1,200-unit plan.

It is worth noting that the proposed industrial development is only included under the General Plan and 800 and 1,200-unit plans, but not the Initiative Scenario. In addition to the residential components, the industrial land use is also a contributing factor when estimating the number of daily and peak-hour vehicles that would be generated.

Roadway Segment Level of Service. Roadway segment level of service was estimated for the Existing Conditions as well as each development scenario, using the standard methodology prescribed by the City of Fremont and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency. Level of service results are a function of projected vehicle speeds and volumes as well as roadway type. A comparison of roadway service levels is a good indicator of potential impacts and the need for transportation improvement measures.

Table 4 in Section 4 of this summary report provides a comparison of roadway segment service levels for each segment under each development scenario. The Fremont Travel Forecast Model reports 2005 Baseline service levels that are similar but not always exactly the same as monitoring reports published by Caltrans and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency. This is often a function of when traffic counts were taken to conduct the analysis (the year and month can lead to a variation). Overall, the City of Fremont Travel Forecast Model is consistent with these other published sources, however.

The primary factor affecting projected roadway volumes in 2025 is not which development scenario is being analyzed, but rather the overall growth of traffic and how it is distributed across the entire roadway network. Each development scenario would result in differing impacts, and some would result in deficient levels of service on area roadways.

Between 2005 and 2025, the roadway segments that are predicted to experience deficiencies in service levels are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Roadway Segment Analysis - -Projected LOS Deficiencies

Roadway and Direction	Segment	Deficient Time Period
SR-84 EB	Ardenwood Blvd to I-880	PM Peak Hour
Ardenwood Blvd SB	Lowry Rd to Paseo Padre Pkwy	AM Peak Hour
Ardenwood Blvd NB	Lowry Rd to Paseo Padre Pkwy	PM Peak Hour
Ardenwood Blvd SB*	Paseo Padre Pkwy to SR-84	AM Peak Hour
Ardenwood Blvd NB*	Paseo Padre Pkwy to SR-84	PM Peak Hour
Ardenwood Blvd SB	I-880 to Jarvis Ave	AM Peak Hour
Ardenwood Blvd NB	I-880 to Jarvis Ave	PM Peak Hour
Union City Blvd SB*	Dyer St to Lowry Rd	AM Peak Hour
I-880 SB	Alvarado Niles to Fremont Blvd	AM and PM Peak Hrs
I-880 SB	Fremont Blvd to SR-84	AM and PM Peak Hrs
I-880 NB	Fremont Blvd to SR-84	PM Peak Hour
I-880 SB	SR-84 to Thornton Ave	AM and PM Peak Hrs
I-880 NB	SR-84 to Thornton Ave	PM Peak Hour

Of the segments listed above, the ones marked with an * are projected to be measurably worse under the General Plan or the 800 or 1,200-unit Patterson Ranch scenarios, compared to the Initiative Scenario B.

Vehicle Miles Traveled. One of the common measures of effectiveness in cumulative transportation analysis is vehicle miles traveled. It is a function of the proposed land use scenarios and their respective trip generation, as well as the roadway network configuration, job center locations, and surrounding land uses. In order to compare the land use scenarios for this report, all other factors were held constant. Table 5 (in Section 4 of this summary report) provides a comparison of total vehicle miles traveled in the area for each scenario. In general, the number of vehicle miles travels in northwest Fremont is projected to increase by over 50-percent over 20 years (from 2005 to 2025) in both the AM and PM peak hours, due to overall growth in both the local and regional areas. There would be slight increases also associated with each of the development scenarios, when compared to one another.

Summary. Overall, the Initiative Scenario B would generate less vehicle trips, result in less vehicle miles traveled, and impact less roadway segments than the other development scenarios. Regardless of any of the analyzed development scenarios, roadway segments would be impacted by cumulative growth, and overall traffic congestion would increase in the area. There will be a need for transportation improvements associated with the ambient growth of traffic in the area. Localized impacts associated with each development scenario would also need to be addressed.

IV. Summary Tables

This section includes analysis summary tables that were referenced in the preceding text. The tables include

- Table 3. Vehicle Trip Generation Summary
- Table 4. Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis
- Table 5. Vehicle Miles Traveled Summary

Table 3. Trip Generation Summary

General Plan - Existing Zoning

LAND USE	GSF/Units	Daily			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out
Residential										
Single-Family Detached	266	2,558	1,279	1,279	196	49	147	259	163	96
Townhomes and Stacked Flats	0									
Loft (Condomenium)	0									
Residential Sub Total	266	2,558	1,279	1,279	196	49	147	259	163	96
Commercial	0									
Church	0									
Industrial	900,000	5,212	2,606	2,606	560	459	101	735	154	581
Total		7,770	3,885	3,885	756	508	248	994	317	677

Patterson Ranch Proposal (800 Units)

LAND USE	GSF/Units	Daily			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out
Residential										
Single-Family Detached	557	5,048	2,524	2,524	399	100	299	503	317	186
Townhomes and Stacked Flats	223	1,269	635	634	98	17	81	116	78	38
Loft (Condomenium)	20	163	82	81	14	2	12	16	11	5
Residential Sub Total	800	6,480	3,241	3,239	511	119	392	635	406	229
Commercial	40,000	3,238	1,619	1,619	79	48	31	295	142	153
Church	20,000	182	91	91	14	8	6	13	7	6
Industrial	900,000	5,212	2,606	2,606	560	459	101	735	154	581
Total		15,112	7,557	7,555	1,164	634	530	1,678	709	969

Patterson Ranch at 1200 Units

LAND USE	GSF/Units	Daily			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out
Residential										
Single-Family Detached	836	7,330	3,665	3,665	594	149	445	724	456	268
Townhomes and Stacked Flats	335	1,791	896	895	136	23	113	162	109	53
Loft (Condomenium)	30	231	116	115	20	3	17	22	15	7
Residential Sub Total	1,200	9,352	4,677	4,675	750	175	575	908	580	328
Commercial	40,000	3,238	1,619	1,619	79	48	31	295	142	153
Church	20,000	182	91	91	14	8	6	13	7	6
Industrial	900,000	5,212	2,606	2,606	560	459	101	735	154	581
Total		17,984	8,993	8,991	1,403	690	713	1,951	883	1,068

Initiative -- Residential

LAND USE	GSF/Units	Daily			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out
Residential										
Single-Family Detached	100	1,040	520	520	79	20	59	107	67	40
Residential Sub Total	100	1,040	520	520	79	20	59	107	67	40
Commercial	0									
Church	0									
Industrial	0									
Total		1,040	520	520	79	20	59	107	67	40

Table 4. Roadway Segment Analysis

#	Segments	From	To	Number of Lanes	Peak Period	Free Flow Speed (mph)	Roadway Type	2025 Patterson Ranch at 1200 Units			2025 Patterson Ranch Proposal (800 Units)			2025 General Plan			2025 Initiative - Residential Scenario			2005 Baseline		
								Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b
1	State Route 84 (WB)	Toll Plaza	Paseo Padre Pkwy	3	A.M.	55	Freeway	3070	50	C	3090	50	C	3090	50	C	3060	50	C	2100	50	C
				3	P.M.	55	Freeway	2920	50	C	2890	50	C	2890	50	C	2910	50	C	1960	50	C
				3	A.M.	55	Freeway	420	55	C	420	55	C	420	55	C	420	55	C	370	55	C
2	State Route 84 (WB)	Paseo Padre Pkwy	Ardenwood Blvd	3	P.M.	55	Freeway	3790	53	C	3790	53	C	3790	53	C	3830	53	C	2370	55	C
				3	A.M.	55	Freeway	3110	55	C	3030	55	C	3020	55	C	3080	55	C	2330	55	C
				3	P.M.	55	Freeway	2560	55	C	2610	55	C	2590	55	C	2570	55	C	2050	55	C
3	State Route 84 (WB)	Ardenwood Blvd	I-880	3	A.M.	55	Freeway	1010	55	C	1030	55	C	880	55	C	920	55	C	490	55	C
				3	P.M.	55	Freeway	4110	52	C	4120	52	C	4140	52	C	3980	53	C	3130	55	C
				3	A.M.	55	Freeway	4960	42	D	4840	43	D	4930	42	D	4800	43	D	3960	48	D
4	State Route 84 (EB)			3	P.M.	55	Freeway	3790	49	D	3890	48	D	3800	49	D	3720	49	D	3340	49	C
				3	A.M.	55	Freeway	1750	50	C	1750	50	C	1630	50	C	1640	50	C	1840	50	C
				3	P.M.	55	Freeway	5490	36	E	5480	36	E	5500	36	E	5430	37	E	4580	45	D
5	Paseo Padre Pkwy (WB)	State Route 84	Ardenwood Blvd	2	A.M.	45	Urban I	2810	25	C	2870	24	C	2740	26	C	2580	28	B	330	40	A
				2	P.M.	45	Urban I	1960	35	A	1780	37	A	1800	36	A	1540	38	A	910	40	A
				2	A.M.	45	Urban I	810	40	A	750	40	A	770	40	A	630	40	A	440	40	A
6	Paseo Padre Pkwy (EB)			2	P.M.	45	Urban I	2180	33	B	2140	33	B	2050	34	B	2010	35	B	360	40	A
				2	A.M.	45	Urban I	3140	21	D	3260	19	D	3140	21	D	3110	21	D	1910	36	A
				2	P.M.	45	Urban I	1780	37	A	1550	38	A	1550	38	A	1570	38	A	1060	40	A
7	Paseo Padre Pkwy (WB)	Ardenwood Blvd	Deep Creek	2	A.M.	45	Urban I	1120	39	A	1010	40	A	1050	40	A	960	40	A	600	40	A
				2	P.M.	45	Urban I	2690	27	C	2660	27	C	2650	27	C	2620	28	C	1730	37	A
				2	A.M.	45	Urban I	1090	29	B	1100	29	B	1270	28	B	1110	29	B	690	30	B
8	Paseo Padre Pkwy (EB)	Deep Creek	I-880	2	P.M.	45	Urban I	2290	18	D	2200	20	D	2140	20	D	2190	20	D	1570	26	C
				2	A.M.	45	Urban I	1920	23	C	1810	24	C	1910	23	C	1800	24	C	1340	28	C
				2	P.M.	45	Urban I	1720	25	C	1680	25	C	1640	26	C	1670	25	C	940	29	B
9	Paseo Padre Pkwy (WB)	I-880	Fremont Blvd	2	A.M.	45	Urban I	1020	29	B	1020	29	B	1200	29	B	1050	29	B	610	30	B
				2	P.M.	45	Urban I	2250	19	D	2160	20	D	2100	21	D	2150	20	D	1540	27	C
				2	A.M.	45	Urban I	1890	23	C	1790	24	C	1890	23	C	1780	24	C	1310	28	B
10	Ardenwood Blvd (SB)	Lowry Rd	Paseo Padre Pkwy	2	P.M.	45	Urban I	1650	26	C	1610	26	C	1570	26	C	1600	26	C	870	30	B
				2	A.M.	35	Urban II	3930	5	F	3880	5	F	4070	4	F	3840	5	F	1340	28	B
				2	P.M.	35	Urban II	2320	18	C	2320	18	C	2300	18	C	2290	18	C	800	30	B
11	Ardenwood Blvd (NB)			2	A.M.	35	Urban II	1040	29	B	1030	29	B	1020	29	B	1010	29	B	360	30	B
				2	P.M.	35	Urban II	3250	8	F	3170	9	F	3130	9	F	3200	9	F	1350	28	B
				2	A.M.	35	Urban II	3230	9	F	3160	9	F	3050	10	E	2950	11	E	2100	21	C
12	Ardenwood Blvd (SB)	Paseo Padre Pkwy	State Route 84	2	P.M.	35	Urban II	2120	21	C	2120	21	C	2080	21	C	2080	21	C	1310	28	B
				2	A.M.	35	Urban II	1100	29	B	1090	29	B	1070	29	B	1070	29	B	660	30	B
				2	P.M.	35	Urban II	2870	12	E	2760	13	E	2640	14	D	2610	15	D	2050	21	C
13	Ardenwood Blvd (NB)	State Route 84	Jarvis Ave	2	A.M.	35	Urban II	3460	7	F	3390	7	F	3360	8	F	3240	9	F	1910	23	C
				2	P.M.	35	Urban II	2540	15	D	2540	15	D	2540	15	D	2490	16	D	1550	26	B
				2	A.M.	35	Urban II	1530	27	B	1520	27	B	1500	27	B	1460	27	B	1090	29	B
14	Union City Blvd (SB)	Dyer St	Lowry Rd	2	P.M.	35	Urban II	3460	7	F	3290	8	F	3250	8	F	3340	8	F	2410	17	D
				2	A.M.	35	Urban II	3800	14	E	3760	14	E	3920	12	E	3710	14	D	1300	39	A
				2	P.M.	35	Urban II	2300	32	A	2300	32	A	2270	32	A	2270	32	A	800	40	A
15	Union City Blvd (NB)			2	A.M.	35	Urban II	1040	40	A	1020	40	A	1010	40	A	1000	40	A	350	40	A
				2	P.M.	35	Urban II	3140	21	C	3060	22	C	3030	22	C	3090	22	C	1300	39	A
				3	A.M.	30	Urban III	3860	12	D	3830	13	D	3750	13	C	3990	12	D	2370	22	B
16	Decoto Rd (WB)	I-880	Fremont Blvd	3	P.M.	30	Urban III	2530	21	B	2490	21	B	2520	21	B	2540	21	B	1550	24	B
				3	A.M.	30	Urban III	1570	24	B	1570	24	B	1580	24	B	1590	24	B	950	25	B
				3	P.M.	30	Urban III	3770	13	C	3800	13	D	3810	13	D	3770	13	C	2480	13	C
17	Decoto Rd (EB) ^c			3	A.M.	30	Urban III	2260	27	A	2190	27	A	2090	28	A	2210	27	A	1240	28	A
				3	P.M.	30	Urban III	1620	29	A	1630	29	A	1600	29	A	1590	29	A	1000	29	A
				3	A.M.	30	Urban III	800	30	A	810	30	A	830	30	A	840	30	A	680	30	A
18	Decoto Rd (WB) ^d	Fremont Blvd	Paseo Padre Pkwy	3	P.M.	30	Urban III	2020	28	A	1990	28	A	1900	28	A	1900	28	A	1420	29	A

Table 4. Roadway Segment Analysis

#	Segments	From	To	Number of Lanes	Peak Period	Free Flow Speed (mph)	Roadway Type	2025 Patterson Ranch at 1200 Units			2025 Patterson Ranch Proposal (800 Units)			2025 General Plan			2025 Initiative - Residential Scenario			2005 Baseline		
								Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b	Link Volume	Speed ^a	LOS ^b
14	I-880 (SB)	Alvarado Niles Blvd	Fremont Blvd	3	A.M.	65	Freeway	7390	12	F	7370	12	F	7370	12	F	7480	12	F	4140	47	D
				3	P.M.	65	Freeway	6360	24	F	6320	25	F	6330	25	F	6350	24	F	5090	41	E
	I-880 (NB)			3	A.M.	65	Freeway	2110	50	C	2110	50	C	2110	50	C	2110	50	C	1610	50	C
15				3	P.M.	65	Freeway	6660	20	F	6610	21	F	6620	21	F	6670	20	F	4170	47	D
	I-880 (SB)	Fremont Blvd	State Route 84	3	A.M.	65	Freeway	7560	11	F	7510	11	F	7532	11	F	7740	10	F	5290	39	E
				3	P.M.	65	Freeway	6540	22	F	6640	20	F	6620	21	F	6610	21	F	5440	37	E
	I-880 (NB)			4	A.M.	65	Freeway	3190	50	C	3200	50	C	3210	50	C	3200	50	C	1940	50	C
				4	P.M.	65	Freeway	7820	31	E	7840	31	E	7950	30	F	7910	30	E	6090	45	D
16	I-880 (SB)	State Route 84	Thornton Ave	3	A.M.	65	Freeway	7160	14	F	7190	14	F	6860	18	F	7370	12	F	5230	39	E
				3	P.M.	65	Freeway	6380	24	F	6370	24	F	6390	24	F	6380	24	F	5150	40	E
	I-880 (NB)			4	A.M.	65	Freeway	4060	50	C	4050	50	C	4030	50	C	4000	50	C	2440	50	C
				4	P.M.	65	Freeway	7340	36	E	7460	35	E	7490	34	E	7360	36	E	5680	47	D

a. Speed is calculated from City of Fremont Travel Forecast Model, in miles per hour.
b. LOS = Level of Service. Speed/Level of Service relationships from Alameda County Congestion Management Program, as per Highway Capacity Manual.
c. For 2005 baseline scenario, calculated speed of eastbound traffic on Decoto Road between I-880 and Fremont Blvd is based on existing two lanes.
d. For 2005 baseline scenario, calculated speed of westbound traffic on Decoto Road between I-880 and Fremont Blvd is based on existing two lanes.

Table 5. Vehicle Miles Traveled Summary

Scenario	Vehicle Miles Traveled	
	AM Peak	PM Peak
2005 Baseline	44,541	60,376
2025 Initiative - Residential	72,644	89,412
2025 General Plan	73,320	90,192
2025 Patterson Ranch Proposal (800 Units)	73,229	90,698
2025 Patterson Ranch at 1200 Units	74,738	91,666

Source: Fremont Travel Forecast Model, Northwest Fremont Area